

Exhibit B

PARTIES LISTED ON SIGNATURE PAGE

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION**

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED)	
LLC and MCM PORTFOLIO LLC,)	Case Number: C 14-03640-CW
Plaintiffs,)	AMENDED PATENT DISCLOSURES
vs.)	PURSUANT TO P.R. 3-1 AND 3-2
CANON, INC., et al.,)	Hon. Judge Claudia Wilken
Defendant(s).)	
<hr/>		
TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED)	
LLC and MCM PORTFOLIO LLC,)	Case Number: C 14-03643-CW
Plaintiffs,)	AMENDED PATENT DISCLOSURES
vs.)	PURSUANT TO P.R. 3-1 AND 3-2
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,)	Hon. Judge Claudia Wilken
Defendant(s).)	
<hr/>		
TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED)	
LLC and MCM PORTFOLIO LLC,)	Case Number: C 14-03645-CW
Plaintiffs,)	AMENDED PATENT DISCLOSURES
vs.)	PURSUANT TO P.R. 3-1 AND 3-2
NEWEGG INC., et al.,)	Hon. Judge Claudia Wilken
Defendant(s).)	
<hr/>		
TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED)	
LLC and MCM PORTFOLIO LLC,)	Case Number: C 14-03646-CW
Plaintiffs,)	AMENDED PATENT DISCLOSURES

) PURSUANT TO P.R. 3-1 AND 3-2
vs.)
SEIKO EPSON CORPORATION, et al.,) Hon. Judge Claudia Wilken
Defendant(s).)

Pursuant to Local P.R. 3-1, 3-2, and 3-6, Plaintiffs Technology Properties Limited LLC (“TPL”) and MCM Portfolio LLC (“MCM”) (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) submit this disclosure of asserted claims and amended preliminary infringement contentions to Defendants Canon, Inc., Canon U.S.A., Inc., (collectively “Canon”), Hewlett-Packard Company (“HP”), Newegg Inc. (“Newegg”), Rosewill Inc. (“Rosewill”), and Seiko Epson Corporation and Epson America, Inc. (collectively “Seiko”) (collectively “Defendants”). These amended contentions are served in light of the Court’s September 18, 2015 claim construction order and apply the claim constructions set forth in that order.

I. Local P.R. 3-1 Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions

- (a) Each claim of each patent in suit that is allegedly infringed by each opposing party, including for each claim the applicable statutory subsections of 35 U.S.C. §271 asserted;

Plaintiffs contend that Defendants infringe the claims identified in the attached and incorporated exhibits, particularly Exhibit 27, the Accused Products list.

Defendants' infringement is direct pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 271(a), as established in the claim charts attached as Exhibits 1 through 26 (including Amended Exhibits 1-6 and 11-18 served herewith) and Exhibits A through SSSS and all other claim charts and evidence incorporated herein by reference (see below). Plaintiffs reserve the right to augment or supplement their contentions to identify additional claims infringed by Defendants after

1 discovery, in response to Defendants' P.R. 3-4 production, or as permitted under the Patent
2 Rules.

3 (b) **Separately for each asserted claim, each accused apparatus, product, device,**
4 **process, method, act, or other instrumentality ("Accused Instrumentality")**
5 **of each opposing party of which the party is aware. This identification shall**
6 **be as specific as possible. Each product, device, and apparatus shall be**
7 **identified by name or model number, if known. Each method or process shall**
8 **be identified by name, if known, or by any product, device, or apparatus**
9 **which, when used, allegedly results in the practice of the claimed method or**
10 **process;**

11 Defendants' infringement pertains to the Accused Products and associated asserted
12 claims identified in Exhibit 27 as well as the Accused Products or Accused Instrumentalities
13 identified in the claim charts attached as Exhibits 1 through 26 (including Amended Exhibits 1-6
14 and 11-18 served herewith) and Exhibits A through SSSS and all other claim charts and evidence
incorporated herein by reference (see below).

15 Plaintiffs expect that this disclosure may be subject to amendment or supplementation to
16 identify and accuse additional products released, developed, or made available by Defendants
17 after the date on which these contentions are served, or of which Plaintiffs were not aware at the
18 time of these contentions.

19 Exhibits 27 includes accused products for Defendants' that Plaintiffs believe are, or have
20 been, capable of reading SD and MMC cards in the same slot based on information presently
21 available to Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs are not accusing products of infringement that have never been
22 capable of reading SD and MMC cards in the same slot with a shared set of contact pins.

23 Exhibit 28 contains a list of products that are accused to the extent that they are, or have
24 been, capable of reading both SD and MMC cards in the same slot. While the products listed in

1 Exhibit 28 do not appear to be specifically advertised as being capable of reading MMC cards,
2 Plaintiffs believe that it is likely that these products are capable reading both SD and MMC
3 cards.¹ See Exhibit 29, Declaration of Dale E. Buscaino. After Plaintiff has an opportunity for
4 discovery to determine whether the products listed in Exhibit 28 are, or have been, capable of
5 reading SD and MMC cards, Plaintiffs intend to supplement its list of accused products in
6 Exhibit 27 as necessary.

7

8 **(c) A chart identifying specifically where each limitation of each asserted claim**
9 **is found within each Accused Instrumentality, including for each limitation**
10 **that such party contends is governed by 35 U.S.C. § 112(6), the identity of the**
11 **structure(s), act(s), or material(s) in the Accused Instrumentality that**
12 **performs the claimed function.**

13 Charts identifying where each element or step of the asserted claims is found within, or
14 performed by, each Accused Instrumentality are attached as 1 through 26 (including Amended
15 Exhibits 1-6 and 11-18 served herewith) and Exhibits A through SSSS and all other claim charts
16 and evidence incorporated herein by reference (see below). Plaintiffs have not included charts
17 for each accused product, as Plaintiffs contend that all accused products infringe the asserted
18 claims in substantially the same manner. Rather, Plaintiffs have included claim charts, citations
19 to the same, and citations to infringement analyses of representative products and explanations of
20 how each accused product infringes. A complete list of each product that Plaintiffs contends
21 infringes, based on information available to date, is attached as Exhibit 27. A declaration of
22 Dale E. Buscaino, attached as Exhibit 29, confirms that each accused product listed in Exhibit 27
23 infringes certain claims of the '424 and '443 patents.

24

25

26 ¹ Indeed, certain Respondents in the ITC investigations modified their products to not read MMC during the
27 investigations. Thus, the fact that a product is not advertised to read MMC does not indicate that it has never read
both SD and MMC card types.

1 In addition, Plaintiffs refer Defendants to, and incorporates by reference, Plaintiffs'
2 technical tutorial submitted to the Court in the Eastern District of Texas for these cases,² which
3 also explains Plaintiffs' contentions as to how Defendants infringe. This tutorial has been
4 produced to all Defendants.

5 Further, Plaintiff notes ALJ Essex's findings regarding representative products in 337-
6 TA-841. ALJ Essex found Respondents' arguments against TPL's use of representative products
7 during the ITC trial as "puzzling," "smack[ing] of petty gamesmanship," and not "genuine"
8 disputes. (Initial Determination at 82-84). ALJ Essex found that Respondents "do not go so far
9 as to dispute that the products included in the infringement charts are not, in fact, representative."
10 *Id.* at 82. "Respondents do not assert that the controller and connector assemblies actually
11 perform the certain functions differently or have different attributes nor do they present any
12 evidence to that effect. Respondents also do not assert that the information set forth in the tables
13 is inaccurate. Rather, Respondents argue that the controllers and connector assemblies are
14 manufactured differently, have different configurations and specifications, schematics, design
15 considerations, etc. but do not explain or cite to any evidence as to how these differences would
16 affect the assumption that the representative products are accurate representations of the accused
17 products for purposes of infringement analysis. There is no evidence before the ALJ that these
18 different controllers and connector assemblies are so different as to make the representative
19 product an inadequate means of showing how these controllers or connector assemblies work. In
20 sum, it appears to the ALJ that Respondents argue that TPL should not have used representative
21 products and should have performed an analysis on each and every single accused product, but
22

26 _____
27 ² This tutorial was not submitted to the court in the Sony case, as Sony was not part of the claim construction
proceedings for which the tutorial was submitted.
28

fail to present any evidence that the representative products relied upon by TPL are inaccurate representations of the Uncharted Products. According to Respondents, TPL should have charted every accused product in this investigation. Absent some showing by Respondents that the representative products relied upon are not, in fact, representative of all of the accused products, the ALJ will not make such an onerous requirement. Infringement analyses of accused products based on analyses of representative products is not a novel concept before this ALJ and the Commission and, given the size of Section 337 investigations and the number of accused products, it is a fairly common practice for complainants to use representative products in proving infringement. While Respondents are, of course, not *required* to stipulate to representative products, a failure to do so, especially in cases such as this one where there is no *genuine* dispute as to whether the representative product is an accurate representation of the accused products, smacks of petty of gamesmanship. The purpose and focus of a Section 337 investigation as it relates to infringement is to determine whether the accused products infringe the asserted patent and any means of making such a determination more streamlined and focused should be the goal of all parties participating in the investigation. Consequently, to the extent that Respondents argument appears to be that TPL has failed to prove infringement because it failed to chart each and every accused product, the ALJ finds such a requirement unnecessary given that there is no evidence before the ALJ that the representative products are inaccurate.” *Id.* at 83-84.

Further, Plaintiffs note the Commission reversed ALJ Essex’s determination that TPL failed to show that the accused products can transfer data to or from SD cards with a four-bit-bus....” (Comm’n Op. at 19). The Commission found that “neither Respondents nor

1 Respondents' experts or fact witnesses dispute that the accused controllers operate in 4-bit SD
2 mode when an SD card is inserted and in 1-bit MMC mode when an MMC card is inserted into
3 the card connector." *Id.* at 19-20.

4 While various Accused Products for each Defendant may employ different controllers or
5 card connectors, Plaintiffs contend that there are no material differences for purposes of
6 infringement between (A) the controllers and card connectors shown in these contentions and (B)
7 all of the controllers and card connectors in the Accused Products listed in Exhibit 27³ to these
8 contentions for which the controllers and card connectors are not shown. As stated in Exhibit 1
9 to Plaintiffs' N.D. Cal. preliminary infringement contentions, various exemplar memory card
10 connectors and controllers are shown in the claim charts attached as exhibits to Plaintiffs'
11 preliminary infringement contentions and in the documents (including claim charts, expert
12 reports, exhibits thereto, and witness statements) cited herein. Plaintiffs have not been able to
13 discern any material differences between the controllers and memory card connectors (regardless
14 of the controller/connector combination) in these products for purposes of infringement and
15 contend that there are no material differences between memory card connectors and controllers
16 of all Accused Products for purposes of infringement.

17 In response to Canon's and Epson's requests for Plaintiffs to further explain why
18 representative products are appropriate, Plaintiffs state as follows:

19 1. Exhibit 30 shows various card connectors and controllers in a sampling of
20 accused Canon products. Exhibit 31 shows various card connectors and controllers in a
21 sampling of accused Epson products. Plaintiffs discern no material differences for purposes of
22

23

24 ³ And Exhibit 28 to the extent that the products listed therein are, or have been, capable of reading both SD and
25 MMC cards in the same slot

infringement among these card connectors and among these controllers (regardless of connector/controller combination). Plaintiffs also discern no material differences for purposes of infringement among all of the various exemplar memory card connectors and among all of the various exemplar controllers (regardless of the connector/controller combination) shown in the claims charts attached as exhibits to Plaintiffs' preliminary infringement contentions and in the documents (including claim charts, expert reports, exhibits thereto, and witness statements) cited herein.

2. With respect to each Defendant, Plaintiffs similarly believe that there are no material differences for purposes of infringement among the Accused Products, including the reason stated in paragraph 1 above regarding the card connectors and controllers (regardless of the connector/controller combination).

3. Mr. Buscaino's declaration, attached as Exhibit 29, confirms Plaintiffs' contentions and Plaintiffs' explanation regarding why representative products are appropriate in these cases.

4. Inv. 337-TA-841 also confirms Plaintiffs' contentions and explanation regarding why representative products are appropriate in these cases.

5. The ALJ’s ruling on the issue of representative products and infringement in Inv. 337-TA-841 is discussed above. In particular, the ALJ stated that “Respondents . . . do not go so far as to dispute that the products included in the infringement claims charts are not, in fact, representative.” Initial Determination at 82. The ALJ further stated that “Respondents do not assert that the controller and connector assemblies actually perform the certain functions differently or have different attributes nor do they present any evidence to that effect,” *id.* at 83,

and that Respondent' failure to stipulate to representative products, "especially in cases such as this one where there is no *genuine* dispute as to whether the representative product is an accurate representation of the accused products, smacks of petty of gamesmanship," *id.* at 83-84. The ALJ's ruling on these points was unchanged by the Commission opinion.

6. Consistent with Mr. Buscaino’s declaration attached as Exhibit 29, Mr. Buscaino found no material differences in Inv. 337-TA-841 between the controllers and card connectors for purposes of infringement. And, Plaintiffs’ understanding of Respondents’ experts’ testimony is that there are no material differences between the Accused Products for purposes of infringement, including that the various controllers, card connectors, and combinations thereof have no material differences for purposes of infringement.

7. Plaintiffs' infringement contentions have not changed since Inv. 337-TA-841.

8. Canon and Seiko have not identified any specific differences between the card connectors and controllers of the Accused Products—let alone any differences that are material to infringement. The same is true for all Defendants with respect to any aspect of TPL’s infringement contentions for any Accused Product. No Defendant has presented Plaintiffs with a single product that is allegedly not represented for purposes of infringement by the products charted for that Defendant. During meet and confer calls, counsel for Canon and Epson could not provide such an example. Plaintiffs requested defense counsel to bring any such examples to Plaintiffs’ attention so that any dispute could be worked out or explained. To date, no examples have been provided. Indeed, Canon and Epson agreed on meet and confers with Plaintiffs that representative products can be appropriate and that separate claim charts are not necessarily

required for each accused product under the Local Rules. Such a requirement would defeat the entire purpose of representative products.

However, if any Defendant believe that there are differences for purposes of infringement between any Accused Product and the products charted and shown in these contentions, including but not limited to any material difference between (A) the controllers and card connectors shown in these contentions and (B) any of the controllers and card connectors in the Accused Products for which the controllers and card connectors are not shown, Plaintiffs request that the Defendant advise Plaintiffs of (i) the product name that it contends is materially different and (ii) the claim element that is materially different for purposes of infringement, and Plaintiffs will provide additional explanation, if possible, as to why there is no material difference.

(d) For each claim which is alleged to have been indirectly infringed, an identification of any direct infringement and a description of the acts of the alleged indirect infringer that contribute to or are inducing that direct infringement. Insofar as alleged direct infringement is based on joint acts of multiple parties, the role of each such party in the direct infringement must be described.

At this time, Plaintiffs are not pursuing allegations in these cases that Defendants indirectly infringe. At this time, Plaintiffs are not pursing allegations in these cases that Defendants' direct infringement is based on joint acts of multiple parties.

(e) Whether each limitation of each asserted claim is alleged to be literally present or present under the doctrine of equivalents in the Accused Instrumentality;

Plaintiffs contend that each element of each asserted claim is literally present in the Accused Instrumentalities or, in the alternative, present under the doctrine of equivalents. See Amended Exhibits 2-4 which set forth Plaintiffs' additional/alternative contentions for equivalents and/or under the doctrine of equivalents for each accused product for the following elements:

1 “type of memory [media] card,” “interconnection means,” “means for identifying . . . ,” “means
2 for determining . . . ,” and “integrated within.”

3 **(f) For any patent that claims priority to an earlier application, the priority date**
4 **to which each asserted claim allegedly is entitled; and**

5 Plaintiff contends that the ‘443, ‘424, and ‘847 patents are entitled to a priority date of at
6 least the application date of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,638/Application No. 09/610,904 - July 6,
7 2000.

8 **(g) If a party claiming patent infringement wishes to preserve the right to rely,**
9 **for any purpose, on the assertion that its own apparatus, product, device,**
10 **process, method, act, or other instrumentality practices the claimed**
11 **invention, the party shall identify, separately for each asserted claim, each**
12 **such apparatus, product, device, process, method, act, or other**
13 **instrumentality that incorporates or reflects that particular claim.**

14 Plaintiff TPL’s OnSpec brand chips are incorporated into products that practice claimed
15 inventions in the patents-in-suit, but Plaintiffs have no instrumentality of their own that practices
16 the claimed inventions.

17 **(h) If a party claiming patent infringement alleges willful infringement, the basis**
18 **for such allegation.**

19 At this time, Plaintiffs are not pursuing allegations that Defendants’ infringement is
20 willful.

21 * * * * *

22 Plaintiff’s references above to “all other claim charts and evidence incorporated herein by
23 reference” include the following items:

- 24 • Inv. 337-TA-841 Initial Expert Report of Dale Buscaino and exhibits, October 19, 2012.

- 1 • Inv. 337-TA-841 Supplemental Report of Dale Buscaino and exhibits, October 24, 2012
(re: HP Only).
- 2
- 3 • Inv. 337-TA-807 Expert Report of Dale Buscaino and exhibits (re: Sony only)
- 4
- 5 • Inv. 337-TA-841 Deposition of Dale Buscaino
- 6
- 7 • Inv. 337-TA-841 Trial Testimony of Dale Buscaino, at January 7, 2012, p. 415- January
8, 2012, p. 795

Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
CX-0073	C	Canon Ex. 1 - Infringement Analysis Chart to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1043428-TPL1043430	A
CX-0074	C	Canon Ex. 2 -424 Canon PIXMA MG8220 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1043431-TPL1043469	B
CX-0075	C	Canon Ex. 3 -443 Canon PIXMA MG8220 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1043470-TPL1043499	C
CX-0094	C	HiTi Ex. 1 -Infringement Analysis Chart to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1043932-TPL1043933	D
CX-0095	C	HiTi Ex. 2 - 424 HiTi P110S to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1043934-TPL1043976	E
CX-0096	C	HiTi Ex. 3 -443 HiTi P110S to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1043977-TPL1043988	F
CX-0097	C	HP Ex. 1 - Notebook Infringement Analysis Chart to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1043989-TPL1043996	G
CX-0098	C	HP Ex. 2- Printer Infringement Analysis Chart to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1043997-TPL1043999	H
CX-0099	C	HP Ex. 3 -424 HP 630 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044000-TPL1044018	I

1	Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
2	CX-0100	C	HP Ex. 4 -424 HP 644491-001 Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044019- TPL1044040	J
3	CX-0101	C	HP Ex. 5 -424 HP [REDACTED] Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044041- TPL1044080	K
4	CX-0102	C	HP Ex. 6 -424 HP Photosmart 5510 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044081- TPL1044116	L
5	CX-0103	C	HP Ex. 7 - 443 HP 630 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044117- TPL1044126	M
6	CX-0104	C	HP Ex. 8- 443 HP 644491-001 Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044127- TPL1044143	N
7	CX-0105	C	HP Ex. 9 - 443 HP [REDACTED] Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044144- TPL1044158	O
8	CX-0106	C	HP Ex. 10 - 443 HP Photosmart 5510 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044159- TPL1044187	P
9	CX-0107	C	HP Ex. 11 -549 HP 644491-001 Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044188- TPL1044219	Q
10	CX-0108	C	HP Ex. 12 - 549 HP [REDACTED] Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044220- TPL1044248	R
11	CX-0109	C	HP Ex. 15 - 847 HP [REDACTED] Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044249- TPL1044269	S
12	CX-0110	C	HP Amended Exhibit 4 - 424 HP 644491-001 Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044270- TPL1044297	T

1	Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
2	CX-0111	C	HP Amended Exhibit 5-424 HP [REDACTED] Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044298- TPL1044340	U
3	CX-0112	C	HP Amended Exhibit 8 -443 HP 644491-001 Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044341- TPL1044363	V
4	CX-0113	C	HP Amended Exhibit 9 - 443 HP [REDACTED] Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044364- TPL1044380	W
5	CX-0114	C	HP Amended Exhibit 11 - 549 HP 644491-001 Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044381- TPL1044418	X
6	CX-0115	C	HP Amended Exhibit 12 - 549 HP [REDACTED] Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044419- TPL1044449	Y
7	CX-0116	C	HP Amended Exhibit 15 - 847 HP [REDACTED] Card Reader to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044450- TPL1044472	Z
8	CX-0117	C	Kingston Ex. 1 -Infringement Analysis Chart to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044473- TPL1044474	AA
9	CX-0118		Kingston Ex. 2 - 424 Kingston FCR-HS219-1 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044475- TPL1044513	BB
10	CX-0119	C	Kingston Ex. 3 - 443 Kingston FCR-HS219-1 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044514- TPL1044528	CC
11	CX-0120	C	Kingston Ex. 4- 623 Kingston FCR HS219-1 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	-TPL1044529- TPL1044542	DD
12	CX-0121	C	Rosewill Ex. 1 - Infringement Analysis Chart to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044543- TPL1044544	EE

Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.	
1	CX-0122	C	Rosewill Ex. 2 -424 Rosewill RCR-YJ-EX601 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044545-TPL1044561	FF
2	CX-0123	C	Rosewill Ex. 3 - 443 Rosewill RCR-YJ-EX601 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044562-TPL1044572	GG
3	CX-0124	C	Rosewill Ex. 4- 549 Rosewill RCR-YJ-EX601 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044573-TPL1044598	HH
4	CX-0125	C	Rosewill Ex. 5 -623 Rosewill RCR-YJ-EX601 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044599-TPL1044615	II
5	CX-0126	C	Seiko Ex. 1 -Seiko Epson Infringement Analysis Chart to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert	TPL1044616-TPL1044619	JJ
6	CX-0127	C	Seiko Ex. 2 - 424 Seiko Epson Artisan 730 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044620-TPL1044659	KK
7	CX-0128	C	Seiko Ex. 3 -443 Seiko Epson Artisan 730 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044660-TPL1044692	LL
8	CX-0129	C	Seiko Ex. 4 -549 Seiko Epson Artisan 730 to Dale Buscaino's Initial Expert Report	TPL1044693-TPL1044720	MM
9		TPL Complaint Exhibit 41- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to Accused Falcon Northwest Computer Systems Product	TPL 1022004-TPL1022020	NN	
10		TPL Complaint Exhibit 43- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Falcon Northwest Computer Systems product	TPL1022030-TPL1022041	OO	
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
		TPL Complaint Exhibit 44- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,162,549 to accused Falcon Northwest Computer Systems product	TPL1022042-TPL1022064	PP
		TPL Complaint Exhibit 45- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 6,976,623 to accused Falcon Northwest Computer Systems product	TPL1022065-TPL1022090	QQ
		TPL Complaint Exhibit 96- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Shuttle, Inc. product	TPL1022868-TPL1022885	RR
		TPL Complaint Exhibit 98- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Shuttle, Inc. product	TPL1022892-TPL1022904	SS
CX-0021		TPL Complaint Exhibit 24- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Canon, Inc. product	TPL1021646-TPL1021667	TT
CX-0022		TPL Complaint Exhibit 26- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Canon, Inc. product	TPL1021674-TPL1021701	UU
CX-0032		TPL Complaint Exhibit 55- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Hewlett-Packard Company product	TPL1022235-TPL1022257	VV
CX-0033		TPL Complaint Exhibit 57- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Hewlett-Packard Company product	TPL1022276-TPL1022299	WW

1	Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
2	CX-0034		TPL Complaint Exhibit 58- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,162,549 to accused Hewlett- Packard Company product	TPL1022300- TPL1022320	XX
3	CX-0035		TPL Complaint Exhibit 59- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,719,847 to accused Hewlett- Packard product	TPL1022321- TPL1022334	YY
4	CX-0036		TPL Complaint Exhibit 60- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused HiTi Digital, Inc. product	TPL1022335- TPL1022356	ZZ
5	CX-0037		TPL Complaint Exhibit 62- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused HiTi Digital, Inc., product	TPL1022360- TPL1022370	AAA
6	CX-0038		TPL Complaint Exhibit 63- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,162,549 to accused HiTi Digital, Inc., product	TPL1022371- TPL1022391	BBB
7	CX-0039		TPL Complaint Exhibit 64- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Kingston Technology Company, Inc. product	TPL1022392- TPL1022409	CCC
8	CX-0040		TPL Complaint Exhibit 66- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Kingston Technology Company, Inc., product	TPL1022420- TPL1022431	DDD
9	CX-0041		TPL Complaint Exhibit 67- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 6,976,623 to accused Kingston Technology Company, Inc., product	TPL1022432- TPL1022446	EEE

Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
1	CX-0042	TPL Complaint Exhibit 77- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Rosewill, Inc. product	TPL1022569-TPL1022585	FFF
2	CX-0043	TPL Complaint Exhibit 80- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Rosewill, Inc., product	TPL1022595-TPL1022603	GGG
3	CX-0044	TPL Complaint Exhibit 81- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,162,549 to accused Rosewill, Inc. product	TPL1022604-TPL1022624	HHH
4	CX-0045	TPL Complaint Exhibit 82- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 6,976,623 to accused Rosewill, Inc. product	TPL1022625-TPL1022644	III
5	CX-0046	TPL Complaint Exhibit 91- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Seiko Epson Corporation product	TPL1022763-TPL1022784	JJJ
6	CX-0047	TPL Complaint Exhibit 93- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Seiko Epson Corporation product	TPL1022800-TPL1022819	KKK
7	CX-0048	TPL Complaint Exhibit 94- Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,162,549 to accused Seiko Epson Corporation product	TPL1022820-TPL1022843	LLL
8	CX-0049	TPL Complaint Exhibit 95 Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,162,549 to accused Seiko Epson Corporation product	TPL1022844-TPL1022867	MMM
9		TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		NNN
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

1	Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
2			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		OOO
3			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		PPP
4			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		QQQ
5			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		RRR
6			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		SSS
7			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		TTT
8			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		UUU
9			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		VVV
10			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		WWW
11			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		XXX
12			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		YYY
13			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		ZZZ
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

1	Tr. Ex. No	Conf.	Description	Bates Range	Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
2			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		AAAA
3			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		BBBB
4			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		CCCC
5			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		DDDD
6			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		EEEE
7			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		FFFF
8			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		GGGG
9			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		HHHH
10			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		III
11			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		JJJJ
12			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused Sony product		KKKK
13			TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused Sony product		LLLL
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

1 Tr. Ex. No	2 Conf.	3 Description	4 Bates Range	5 Infringement Cont. Ex. No.
6	7	8 TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. 9 Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused 10 Sony product	11	12 MMMM
13	14	15 TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. 16 Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused 17 Sony product	18	19 NNNN
20	21	22 TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. 23 Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused 24 Sony product	25	26 OOOO
27	28	29 TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. 30 Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused 31 Sony product	32	33 PPPP
34	35	36 TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. 37 Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused 38 Sony product	39	40 QQQQ
41	42	43 TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. 44 Patent No. 7,522,424 to accused 45 Sony product	46	47 RRRR
48	49	50 TPL Claim Chart applying U.S. 51 Patent No. 7,295,443 to accused 52 Sony product	53	54 SSSS

- 18
19 • Inv. 337-TA-841 Direct Witness Statement of Dale Buscaino: CX-944C (see at least the
20 following specific Q&A listed in the table below).

21 Canon	22 ‘443 - Q&A 547-579, Q&A 581-586 ‘424 - Q&A 587-618, Q&A 620-625
23 HP	24 ‘443 - Q&A 970-1054, Q&A 1056-1062 ‘424 - Q&A 1063-1148, Q&A 1169-1175 ‘847 - Q&A 1176- 1193
25 HiTi	26 ‘443 - Q&A 1252-1272 ‘424 - Q&A 1273-1310
27 Kingston	28 ‘443 - Q&A 1314-1330, Q&A 1331-1336 ‘424 - Q&A 1337- 1367, Q&A 1368-1374
29 Newegg/Rosewill	30 ‘443 - Q&A 1412- 1429 ‘424 - Q&A 1430-1448

1 Seiko	‘443 - Q&A 1514-1541, Q&A 1543-1548 ‘424 - Q&A 1549-1579, Q&A 1580-1586
-------------------	--

- 2
3 • Inv. 807 Direct Witness Statement of Dale Buscaino: CX-0231C (see at least the
4 following specific Q&A listed in the table below, which contains evidence confirming
Sony’s infringement).

5 Sony	‘443 - Q&A 420-429, Q&A 430-537, Q&A 538-540, Q&A 541-543 ‘424 - Q&A 420-429, Q&A 544-553, Q&A 554-696, Q&A 697-702
------------------	--

7 **II. P.R. 3-2 Document Production Accompanying Disclosure**

- 8
9 (a) **Documents (e.g., contracts, purchase orders, invoices, advertisements,
10 marketing materials, offer letters, beta site testing agreements, and third
11 party or joint development agreements) sufficient to evidence each discussion
12 with, disclosure to, or other manner of providing to a third party, or sale of
13 or offer to sell, or any public use of, the claimed invention prior to the date of
application for the patent in suit. A party’s production of a document as
required herein shall not constitute an admission that such document
evidences or is prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102;**

14 Plaintiffs are not aware of any documents in their possession responsive to P.R. 3-2(a).

- 15
16 (b) **All documents evidencing the conception, reduction to practice, design, and
development of each claimed invention, which were created on or before the
date of application for the patent in suit or the priority date identified
pursuant to Patent L.R. 3-1(f), whichever is earlier;**

17
18 Along with the information included in the file histories identified in subsection (c)
19 below, Plaintiff also identifies: U.S. Patent No. 6,438,638, TPL1021052-TPL1021075; the file
20 history of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,638, TPL1006295-TPL1006364; the OnSpec evaluation board
21 dated the fifty-second week of 1998 (ITC Inv. 841 Trial Exhibit CPX0018); and TPL118736-
22 122302, TPL122651- 213147 and TPL391727-391742 as responsive to P.R. 3-2(b).⁴
23

- 24
25 (c) **A copy of the file history for each patent in suit; and**

26
27

⁴ Citations to Bates numbers in this subsection are to documents produced in Investigation 841.

Copies of the file histories for each patent in suit bear the following production numbers:

- 1 i. U.S. Patent No.7,295,443: TPL1002199-TPL1002675;
- 2 ii. U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424: TPL1004133-TPL1004846; and
- 3 iii. U.S. Patent No. 7,719,847: TPL1006725-TPL1010784.⁵
- 4
- 5

6 **(d) All documents evidencing ownership of the patent rights by the party**
7 **asserting patent infringement.**

8 All documents evidencing ownership of the patent rights by Plaintiffs bear the following
9 production numbers:

- 10 i. U.S. Patent No.7,295,443 - TPL1042594-TPL1042652;
- 11 ii. U.S. Patent No. 7,522,424 - TPL1042653-TPL1042711; and
- 12 iii. U.S. Patent No. 7,719,847 - TPL1042771-TPL1042826.
- 13

14 **(e) If a party identifies instrumentalities pursuant to Patent L.R. 3-1(g),**
15 **documents sufficient to show the operation of any aspects or elements of such**
16 **instrumentalities the patent claimant relies upon as embodying any asserted**
claims.

17 See subsection 3-1(g) above.

18 Dated: October 14, 2015

19 By: /s/ Michael P. Kella

20 Anthony G. Simon (*pro hac vice*)

21 Michael P. Kella (*pro hac vice*)

22 Benjamin R. Askew (*pro hac vice*)

23 Timothy D. Krieger (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)

24 THE SIMON LAW FIRM, P.C.

25 800 Market Street, Suite 1700

St. Louis, Missouri 63101

P. 314.241.2929

F. 314.241.2029

asimon@simonlawpc.com

mkella@simonlawpc.com

26 ⁵ Citations to Bates numbers in this subsection are to documents produced in Investigation 841.

baskew@simonlawpc.com
tkrieger@simonlawpc.com

and

Henry C. Bunsow
Denise De Mory
Brian A.E. Smith
BUNSOW DE MORY SMITH & ALLISON LLP
351 California Street, Suite 200
San Francisco, CA 94104
T. (415) 426-4747
F. (415) 426-4744
hbunsow@bdiplaw.com
ddemory@bdiplaw.com
bsmith@bdiplaw.com
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Technology Properties
Limited LLC and MCM Portfolio LLC*